IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE FOURTH DAY OF NOVEMBER

TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE G. BIKSHAPATHY

WRIT PETITION NO : 21027 of 1995

Between:

HAV. MOHD. KHALEEL (Ex-SERVICEMAN)

S/O.MOHD. ISMAIL,

R/O. 9-7-358, 2nd Lancer,

Golconda Post, Hyderabad-500 008

…….. PETITIONER

AND

1. State Bank of India, rep.by its Chief General Manager, Local Head Office, Bank Street, Hyderabad-500 001.
2. State Bank of India, rep.by its Chief General Manager (Admn.), State bank Staff College, 6-3-1188, “HIGHCLIFF”, BEGUMPET, HYDERABAD-500 016.
3. Karna Eashwaraiah, S/o.not known to Petitioner, aged major
4. K.Bhagwanth Reddy S/o not known to petitioner, aged major
5. P.B.Tirumalaiah, S/o.not known to petitioner, aged major
6. D.V.R.Reddy, S/o.not known to petitioner, aged major
7. D.Sreedhar S/o.not known to petitioner, aged major
8. Shaik Khasim Peera S/o. not known to petitioner, aged major
9. C.Chandra Sekhar S/o.not known to petitioner, aged major
10. N.Mahanandi Reddy S/o.not known to petitioner, aged major

(Respondents No.3, 6, 7 and 9 are dismissed for default as per Court Order dated 4-8-2004)

11. Setlam Subba Rao S/o.not known to petitioner, aged major

(Address of all Respondents Nos3 11 is C/o.Chief Manager (Admn.) State Bank Staff College, 6-3-1188 “HIGHCLIFF” Begumpet Road, Hyderabad-500 016)

(RRs.3,6,7,9 Dismissed for default as per Court order dated 4-8-2004)

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue any appropriate writ or order or direction preferably a writ in the nature of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents 1 & 2 in selecting the respondents 3 to 11 as Watchman, in the interview held on 7-8-1995, as being illegal, contrary to norms and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India and subsequently direct the respondent No.2 to appoint the Petitioner as Watchman with the second respondent.

For the Petitioner:MR.P.VENUGOPAL, Advocate

For the Respondent No.1: Mr.K.Srinivasa Murthy, SC for SBI

For the Respondent No.2: MR.B.G.RAVINDER REDDY

For the Respondent No.4,5,8,10 and 11: None appeared.

The Court made the following :

O R D E R:

This petition is filed challenging the appointment of respondents No.3 to 11 and for a consequential direction to appoint the petitioner as a watchman.

2. The petitioner is an ex-serviceman. In pursuance of the interviews conducted by the State Bank of India for appointment of the post of Watchman, number of ex-servicemen appeared, however, the petitioner was not selected by the bank. Aggrieved by the non-selection, he has filed the present writ petition.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the selected candidates were age-barred and they also did not possess requisite vision, and therefore, their appointment is liable to be set aside.

4. I am afraid, I cannot accept this contention. The interviews were conducted by a duly Constituted Select Committee and it will not be appropriate to interfere with the selection made by the constituted authority, unless some malafides are alleged and established. Thus, I do not find any merits in this writ petition.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

G. BIKSHAPATHY, J

Dated 4th November, 2004.

Mrb/Bcj

To

1. The Chief General Manager,State Bank of India, Local Head Office, Bank Street, Hyderabad-500 001.

2. The Chief General Manager (Admn.),, State Bank of India, State bank Staff College, 6-3-1188, “HIGHCLIFF”, BEGUMPET, HYDERABAD-500 016.

3. Two CD copies